

Exhibit 2

Schedule 5.06 — Litigation

1. On April 16, 2007, Herbalife International of America, Inc. filed a Complaint in the United States District Court for the Central District of California against certain former Herbalife distributors who had left the Company to join a competitor. The Complaint alleged breach of contract, misappropriation of trade secrets, intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, intentional interference with contract, unfair competition, constructive trust and fraud and seeks monetary damages, attorney's fees and injunctive relief (*Herbalife International of America, Inc. v. Robert E. Ford, et al*). The court entered a Preliminary Injunction against the defendants enjoining them from further use and/or misappropriation of the Company's trade secrets on December 11, 2007. Defendants appealed the court's entry of the Preliminary Injunction to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. That court affirmed, in relevant part, the Preliminary Injunction. On December 3, 2007, the defendants filed a counterclaim alleging that the Company had engaged in unfair and deceptive business practices, intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage, false advertising and that the Company was an endless chain scheme in violation of California law and seeking restitution, contract rescission and an injunction. Both sides engaged in discovery and filed cross motions for Summary Judgment. On August 25, 2009, the court granted partial summary judgment for Herbalife on all of defendants' claims except the claim that the Company is an endless chain scheme which under applicable law is a question of fact that can only be determined at trial. The court denied defendants' motion for Summary Judgment on Herbalife's claims for misappropriation of trade secrets and breach of contract. On May 5, 2010, the District Court granted summary judgment for Herbalife on defendants' endless chain-scheme counterclaim. Herbalife voluntarily dismissed its remaining claims, and on May 14, 2010, the District Court issued a final judgment dismissing all of the parties' claims. On June 10, 2010 the defendants appealed from that judgment and on June 21, 2010, Herbalife cross-appealed. The Company believes that there is merit to its appeal, and it will prevail upon both its appeal as well as the defendant's appeal.

2. Certain of the Company's subsidiaries have been subject to tax audits by governmental authorities in their respective countries. In certain of these tax audits, governmental authorities are proposing that significant amounts of additional taxes and related interest and penalties are due. The Company and its tax advisors believe that there are substantial defenses to their allegations that additional taxes are owed, and the Company is vigorously contesting the additional proposed taxes and related charges. On May 7, 2010, the Company received an administrative assessment from the Mexican Tax Administration Service in an amount equivalent to approximately \$93 million, translated at the period ended spot rate, for various items, the majority of which was Value Added Tax allegedly owed on certain of the Company's products imported into Mexico during the years 2005 and 2006. This assessment is subject to interest and inflationary adjustments. On July 8, 2010, the Company initiated a formal administrative appeal process. In connection with the appeal of the assessment, the Company may be required to post bonds for some or all of the assessed amount. Therefore, in July 2010, the Company entered into agreements with certain insurance companies to allow for the potential issuance of surety bonds in support of its appeal of the assessment. The Company did not record a provision as the Company, based on analysis and guidance from its advisors, does not believe a loss is probable. Further, the Company is currently unable to reasonably estimate a possible loss or range of loss that could result from an unfavorable outcome in respect to this assessment or any additional assessments that may be issued for these or other periods. The Company believes that it has meritorious defenses and is vigorously pursuing the appeal, but final resolution of this matter could take several years.

These matters may take several years to resolve. While the Company believes it has meritorious defenses, it cannot be sure of their ultimate resolution. Although the Company has reserved amounts for certain matters that the Company believes represent the most likely outcome of the resolution of these related disputes, if the Company is incorrect in the assessment, the Company may have to record additional expenses, when it becomes probable that an increased potential liability is warranted.
